

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 234 450

CS 504 371

AUTHOR Berquist, Goodwin
TITLE From Research Paper to Published Article.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association (Lincoln, NE, April 7-9, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; Graduate Study; *Professional Recognition; *Publications; Research Needs; *Scholarly Journals; Speech Communication; *Writing (Composition); Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS Audience Awareness; Research Papers (Students); *Writing for Publication

ABSTRACT

Developed as part of a program designed to examine why so few graduates of doctoral programs demonstrate their scholarship through the media of books and refereed publications, the four papers in this series address the question of publication. The first paper explains why one should publish, explores differences between graduate term papers and publishable manuscripts, and offers guidelines for new would-be authors. The second paper examines the question of what to publish, noting that the common needs are to write true to the call of one's intimate subject; to relate that intimate subject to significant dialogue occurring in the field; and to take a risk, a calculated risk, in doing it. The paper also suggests six newsworthy topics on developments in speech communication. How to publish is discussed in the third paper, which offers some general thoughts and guidelines to keep in mind when preparing a manuscript for publication, selecting an appropriate journal or related outlet, and otherwise going through the review process. The final paper comments on the problems of getting published and stresses the need for manuscripts to be well thought out, well expressed, and appropriate to a particular group of readers. (HOD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

FROM RESEARCH PAPER TO PUBLISHED ARTICLE

Goodwin Berquist

The Ohio State University

ED234450

Most Ph.D.'s never publish. Of the fifteen percent that do, about half limit themselves to articles growing out of their dissertation research.¹ The question that haunts those of us charged with graduate training is why. Why do so few products of doctoral programs fail to demonstrate their scholarship through the media of books and refereed publications? If Ph.D. programs are designed to train independent scholars capable of original research, why do the graduates of these programs so often fall short of the mark?

At a Central States Speech Association Conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska last April, several of us sought to provide some answers. Goodwin Berquist of The Ohio State University organized the program and led off with a presentation entitled "Why Publish?" William R. Brown, also of The Ohio State University, directed his attention to the theme "Publish What?" Dennis Gouran, former editor of the Central States Speech Journal from Indiana University treated the topic "Publish How?" Don Ecroyd, editor of Communication Education from Temple University closed the session as panel commentator. A manuscript version of what each had to say follows:

CS 504371

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dennis S. Gouran

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

¹ Julie L. Moore, "Bibliographic Control of American Doctoral Dissertations: An Analysis," Special Libraries, July, 1972, p. 287. For an insightful examination of the dissertation snags many students encounter prior to the completion of their degrees, see Gordon B. Davis and Clyde A. Parker Writing the Doctoral Dissertation: A Systematic Approach (Woodbury, New York: Barron's Educational Series, Inc., 1979).

WHY PUBLISH?

GOODWIN F. BERQUIST

The Ohio State University

A critical gap exists between research papers and published articles. Traditionally, it takes four to seven years for a graduate student in Speech Communication to complete a Masters and a Ph.D. degree. The purpose of doctoral study is to produce independent scholars capable of original research. Yet, it is painfully clear that eight of ten Ph.D.'s in our field never publish at all. The question is why.

One answer often given is graduate student burnout. The discipline required, the time involved, the unique commitment to a single academic endeavor, the myriad of false starts and blind alleys, the likelihood of extensive re-writing--all these demands in addition to the requirements of a half-time teaching associateship present the student with what is often the most formidable challenge faced in a long academic career. Typically the successful candidate heaves a huge sigh of relief--glad that his ordeal is over at last, glad that he or she now has the license to be a first class citizen in academia. The desire to escape from the strain to live a little is understandable. What is not clearly understood is that that desire can prove fatal to one's scholarly career. Should the new Ph.D. be placed in an environment where undergraduate teaching and advising are paramount, research is likely to take a back seat. Small college libraries are seldom comparable to those of a graduate degree-granting institution. Demands on the new instructor's time multiply like dandelions in

spring. There is no longer a student-faculty audience exploring the outerreaches of knowledge; instead there are a host of fellow instructors similarly burdened with the never-ending demands of undergraduates and sundry college committees. Good intentions on the part of our research scholars become ideals to dream about rather than challenges to be systematically conquered. Rather like New Year's resolutions, the intent to publish is announced, applauded, and somehow forgotten amid the flurry of immediate demands for time and service elsewhere.

Is the problem reducible to a question of self-discipline? Not in the sense that our new scholars lack this trait, for they do manage to master the disciplinary demands of being full-time staff members. They teach new classes, keep office hours, involve themselves in interesting new projects with students and other faculty, and they are after all holders of the Ph.D. degree -- which means they have a previous record of perserverance.

I think a more telling insight involves the widespread neglect of writing skills common in many of our larger institutions of higher learning. Many graduate students simply have never learned how to write. In some cases, they early achieved excellence in one or more forms of oral communication and have tended thereafter to rest on their laurels. It may be that report writing and written advocacy were seldom stressed in the courses in which they enrolled. Or perhaps they write poorly at best and manage to evade those situations in which this weakness cannot be concealed from others. Writing and re-writing is hard work and personal rewards may come much more easily elsewhere.

There is also of course the problem of the perfectionists. Traditionally these bright students who somehow seem never quite able to achieve perfection. Consequently they never submit a manuscript for review at all. They never get beyond their "own critical judgment. While they may de-cry the quality of what appears in print, they rationalize their own non-productivity by saying "the manuscript is not quite ready yet." In fact, it will never take its place among the pages of our refereed journals and none outside one's immediate colleagues will know of its potential value to the field.

Why publish? Primarily because you have something to say. You wish to share a new insight, report new findings, stimulate fresh thought about a conventional belief or theory. Some write because of the ego satisfaction they receive as a result of seeing their names in print. Others welcome the challenge writing brings because the very act of composition compels us to clarify our own thinking. Many of course publish because they are expected to. If they are to secure tenure in the institution in which they are employed, they must demonstrate their active participation in the scholarship of their field. They must not simply rely upon the work of others but give as well as take. Their task is, as it was in their dissertation odyssey, to expand the store of reliable knowledge. And in so doing, they enhance their own credibility and the prestige of the institutions they serve. Because the body of producing scholars in most academic fields is a small fraction of the profession as a whole, successful journal authors become highly visible and consequently marketable. Oftentimes one will

discover that an essay he or she produced affected others at the time in ways the author only learns about years later. This delayed response is especially welcome because it is so unexpected.

Sometimes a scholar new to the field is unaware of the major differences which exist between the graduate term paper and the publishable manuscript. Consequently, editors from time to time receive seminar papers or even theses without regard for journal policies, the correspondent anxiously inquiring when he or she can expect the piece to appear. In view of such misunderstanding, several key differences seem worthy of note:

	<u>Term Paper</u>	<u>Publishable Manuscript</u>
<u>Purpose</u>	to learn skills	to communicate knowledge
<u>Audience</u>	instructor/fellow students	the reader of the journal
<u>Assumptions</u>	prior knowledge	nothing should be assumed
<u>Resources Involved</u>	limited time/ competing assignments	20-40pp. ms./no limit on either time or research
<u>Nature of the Manuscript</u>	some questions left unanswered	no unanswered questions <u>you</u> are the expert
<u>Respondents</u>	single reader	multiple ^e readings
<u>Response Options</u>	accept	accept/reject/revise and resubmit withdraw/accept with revisions

Some guidelines new would-be authors will want to consider include the following:

1. Build upon what you already know, i.e., the thesis, dissertation, or exceptional term paper. Do not assume that when a professor tells you a paper you have submitted to him or her may

be publishable, that you should submit that paper as is. Rather, you should treat the paper as a promising draft, one step along the way to becoming published.

2. Remember Barzun and Graff's dictum in The Modern Researcher: "No one, however gifted, can produce a passable first draft. Writing means re-writing" (revised edition (1970), p. 37).

3. Never submit a fresh paper. Let it mellow. Seek preliminary opinions from others. We tend to become so pre-occupied with the original process of composition that we sacrifice our own critical abilities. A good essay like a good speech needs to grow and mature over time.

4. Be sure to analyze your target journal in advance and adapt your manuscript accordingly. A written document like a speech has a dimension of source credibility; authors who have not done their homework rarely win the support of critical readers. Costly errors include misspelled words, lack of clarity, factual errors, neglect of primary sources.

5. Remember that the key qualities an editor is seeking includes readability, interest, and suitability.

6. Follow reader/referee suggestions: if the editor asks for revision, do it and resubmit.

7. Always keep in mind that an essay is an argument in need of support.

8. The published article is the key way communication scholars learn about each other; it is how we establish our credibility. Therefore be persistent!

ON WHAT TO PUBLISH

William R. Brown

The most succinct answer to the question posed by the title of this essay has been given in every meeting similar to ours today: News. Like our colleagues in journalism, scholarly editors seem to know when a piece is news; like them, too, we have to admit in programs like this that we don't know much about what the constitutive themes are that make a manuscript offer news to the profession. To say that what to publish is news, then, is a little like saying that the way to be a good hitter is to hit home runs. Like the inevitable follow-up question to that advice--asking what sub-skills combine to make a home-run hitter--the question for advice-givers like us arises as to the components of newsworthy scholarly writing. In what follows, I attempt such a description under the two main heads of common and special topics for scholarly news.

I

Common, I think, to all first-rate manuscripts which I have recommended for publication is their aura that the author is writing out of genuine curiosity. I used to call this quality the Chase of the White Whale; but I am more cautious in my metaphor now, recalling the fate of Ahab and his crew. Today I prefer the phrase used by the late Walter Campbell, who wrote books on the plains Indians under the pseudonym of Stanley Vestal. Recognize your "intimate subject," Campbell would tell would-be free-lance writers, recalling how as a boy in the northern

plains he would spend hours at a time, fascinated, watching members of the Sioux tribe. Campbell wrote about the Sioux and others not because they were a hot topic or trendy in the publishing world of his day but because his considerable story-telling powers were conscripted by the allure of the plains Indians' struggle to keep alive their past, alive in what we would call their rhetorical vision. A former advisee of mine who now appears regularly in our journals has found that argumentation--specifically its multi-formed manifestation in discourse not ordinarily looked upon as argument--conscripts his attention and analytic abilities. Like Coleridge's Ancient Mariner, he will seize the lapel of every editor in sight to tell each such worthy the story of his lonely journeys into the uncharted seas of argument.

To be found by and be true to the call of an "intimate subject" is to best assure oneself of staying power in the pursuit of truth.

But truth, as Tom Benson has recently pointed out only halfway tongue-in-cheek, is not enough.¹ Publishable manuscripts also have, he says, another common, key, quality. They have either to second a claim already being made in the literature or else to contest it.² Where does this leave the new scholar who, being true to his or her intimate subject, feels that a new conversation is needed more than a contribution to an on-going one? Is Benson's benchmark for scholarly news a denial of the imperative arising from one's recognition of what one's intimate subject is? Only, I think, if the puzzle one is solving (if a scientist) or the case one is sleuthing (if a critic or historian) does not admit of connections to other intellectual problems in the arena of scholarly discourse. The presumption has to be that one's intimate subject does relate to an on-going issue in the literature.

Moreover, to relate one's intimate subject to claims already made is to do more than legitimize one's own research interest and sometimes to play the scholar's version of King or Queen of the Mountain; it is, by its tracing out of connections among relevant claims, to ameliorate--however modestly--what Stephen Toulmin and Kenneth Boulding once told me is the most serious intellectual problem of our time: the lack of synthesis in our accelerating accumulation of knowledge. In seconding or contesting a claim, then, a scholarly piece does more than woodenly conducting a "review of the literature" and finding someone's coat-tail to ride on or someone's head to knock. It does more, even, than proving that the new research is clearly relevant to its audience--a component of scholarly news equal to the key just described, the reporter's absorbed attention to the subject of investigation. Climatically, in connecting its problem area, its findings, and its implications with the significant dialogue of its time, the newsworthy research piece plays its part in the quiet drama being played through the media of all ages: the interconnecting of all human intelligence across time and space to the end of enhancing the possibility that the denouement of the human experiment will be triumph rather than tragedy.

In a word, newsworthy research is intellectual mountain-climbing. That means, in the third place, that common to the best pieces coming to editors is their risk-taking. Not reckless risk, of course, but measured risk. One way to know that one's work takes a chance in its formulation is to remember with Wayne Brockriede that important scholarship is more than what he calls the tossing of data into predetermined bins.³ For the qualitative scholar, this means that no newsworthy risk is being taken if the study does nothing more than to fit a communication event onto a model that is a taken-for-granted: to prove, for instance,

that a body of discourse does indeed manifest ethos, pathos, logos; the interaction of act, scene, agent, agency, and purpose; the personae and scenario of rhetorical visioning. For the quantitative researcher, this means that replication must not be mere replication: In addition to confirming the existence of whatever doors to the unknown have been located in the work being replicated, the replication will attempt to open them and enter the rooms of knowledge behind them, however tentatively or boldly. The result may be to take either baby steps (as in precision-seeking programmatic research) or giant steps (as in the leaps of genius intuited in the prepared consciousness of the heuristic thinker). But risk-taking there must be, if the would-be publication is to be newsworthy.

What to publish? The common topics are to write true to the call of one's intimate subject; to relate that intimate subject to significant dialogue occurring in the field; and to take risk, calculated risk, in doing it. Turning now to consider briefly some special topics for the invention of news for the world of research, I plead guilty in advance to affecting (some would say infecting) my calls for research with my own intimate subject, the role of symbol use in the paradoxes pervading human affairs--change amidst continuity and continuity amidst change.

II

Looking back over other attempts on my part to offer calls for research (and in such manner address the question of what to publish), I am impressed by the difficulty of extrapolating future research trends from present ones. The reason, a mathematician-social scientist tells me, is that "it is essentially impossible for the human mind to perform an enumeration of cases systematically for a large number of stages in a

process"⁴ such as that of human communication research, partaking not only of complexity but also of chance. What we tend to get, rather, is what John Wilkinson refers to as "simple extrapolation from a very ill-understood present, "from which it is not useful . . . to get one's 'feed-forwards' to a more or less distant future. . . ." ⁵ Nor do I enjoy the credibility as seer which made the futurizing of Karl Wallace, Douglas Ehninger, and their likes into agendas for many others.

What is left is simply to propose some specific topics for investigation, along the way offering a rationale for pursuing such topics. There are either six or one of them, depending on whether you want to practice the subordination of ideas. I enjoy subordinating ideas, so there will be one superordinate topic and five subordinate ones for inventing newsworthy articles.

The superordinate topic, the study of symbolically-negotiated patterns, does not sound interesting in the abstract. The topic gains relevance, at least, when one realizes--as each of you already has--that the recognition of patterns and their description is what animates current writing on discourse analysis, interpersonal strategies, small-group and decision-making process, genre and movement criticism, rhetoric as epistemic, organizational dynamics (including action research and quality-of-work-life research), and life-cycle or uses and gratifications studies in telecommunication. Further, the topic may enjoy a gain in Significance when we modulate the question of symbolically-negotiated and -exchanged patterns to a new key: Of what ultimate importance might it be to seek the recognition and description of ever-more inclusive patterns in human communication?

It is nothing more nor less than to be able to see better than we now do whether Kenneth Burke's distinction between motion and action is meaningful. To be able to glimpse pervasive patterns in societal communication within and across cultures would be to let us see in what ways our communication behavior is constrained and in what ways it is free--or again to resort to a paraphrase of Burke, to see in what sense it is determined and in what sense it is determining. To the extent that it is determined, our being caught inescapably in some pattern-as-rut would be to remind ourselves of our shared being with everything now in diurnal motion and with the insects and other animals, even though all are unlikely to be patterned in the same way. Without the reductionism of radical behaviorism, it would yet enable us to appreciate the analogue between whatever grand, non-rational fixed patterns in human communicating are discerned--on one hand--and the seemingly purposive but actually constrained patterns of the insects, on the other.⁶ To the extent that it is determining, possibilities for choice and change would be more clearly limned than now is the case, when we seem to assume that any sort of social change lies within our choice either to effect or to prevent. Finally, a firmer grasp of the ways in which we are both constrained and free as communicators would make possible the positing of a theory of symbolic evolution, which Boulding has foreseen as another gear-shift in the speed and scale of human evolution.⁷

All of this sounds high-falutin' as folks say down home in Oklahoma. Or, as Wendell Johnson used to say, full of high ideals in the sense of their being unattainable. This is where the five subordinate topics come in; they seem to me to promise mid-range destinations that

lie along the same routes we now are taking in search of the holy grail--farther along, but not over the horizon--where hopefully awaits the Grand Dead End of determined human communication behavior, the truth that also makes us free. /

One. We need to study much more than we have the extent to which we have the capacity to shift from one way of looking at the world to another. Can persons accustomed to living in a world where the human role is to dominate and exploit nature be full participants in a world where the human role is to live as peer of nature? And vice-versa. At hand is a wealth of data between whites and native Americans--and that issue of worldview surely accounts for much of the variance in Red-White relations, more so I suspect than our current preoccupation of naming each other as savage or victim. Or turning to the world of scholarship, we can and should be asking what if anything happens if we stop thinking of the communication process as a machine and start thinking of it as a hologram, in which concepts such as time and space have to be radically altered under the condition of having all the information in an image stored at each point of that image. Data for such a study are at hand or soon will be in the popular discourses of physicists who have been able to undergo or not to undergo the change in world construal that the physics of holography entails and who in their pro/con stances provide prima facie evidence of the possibilities for perspective-shifting. If neither of these matters appeals to you, pick one that does. For instance, these days we hear an increasing amount of talk about the possibility of shifting persons from the phenomenological stance of a technical consciousness to something else. Further, can persons with "low interaction involvement" switch to being persons with "high interaction

involvement" in their strategic dealings with others? What shift in worldview would be entailed? Regardless of what key to perspective-shifting you study, however, invariants in world views point toward determined patterns, while variants point toward determining patterns.

Two. We need to study much more than we have the possibility that infinite regress, or a tendency toward it, is simply a determined communication pattern, or part of such a pattern--rather than an aberration. Douglas Hofstadter, attempting to relate human creativity to machine intelligence, summons to his aid philosophers of mind--who argue that the nature of the human self-observing monitor has a built-in corrective (described in a moment) which saves us from what would be necessary in a machine with consciousness--namely a machine to monitor first-order operations, with a machine other than that one to monitor the monitor--and so on, in an infinite regress. What Hofstadter and his friends see as the human corrective is, incidentally, an example of what happens when writers start thinking of process as hologram instead of machine: In the biologically and socially constructed human being, writes J. R. Lucas, "the paradoxes of consciousness arise because a conscious being can be aware of itself, as well as of other things, and yet cannot really be construed as being divisible into parts. . . . A conscious being can both consider itself and its performance and yet not be other than that which did the performance."⁸ Back home here in Speech Communication, students of cultural criticism can profitably turn their interest in technology-as-text to the study of infinite regress, machines, and human affairs. For example, the American economy, in its turn toward robotics and high technology, poses the possibility that technology, long thought in scholarly folklore to be a dynamic of

change, is captive to a determined pattern in human communication. How so? Robotics, the new heavy industry which at one view approaches a stage of regress by being machines to monitor machines which build machines, is also potentially the consequence of human regress-"halting" patterns. For the message of robotics "as text" is also that its marriage of computer and mechanical engineering presages a shift from the worker replacement consequences of an economy premised on manufacturing to the worker displacement problems arising when learning, during an age of information via new communication technology, becomes this country's major industry.⁸ If such rhetorical criticism of technology-as-text is uninteresting to you, don't be put off. There are other stories to write. All of us, for example, have been intuitively impressed by the way patterns in human communication seem to be summed up metaphorically as the swinging back and forth of a pendulum in accounts of political history, fashions in scholarship, and the rise and fall of movements, institutions, and careers. Looking at that data again, we may find it worth our while to see it as a post-hoc test of Hofstadter's inkling of a determined communication pattern in human beings: conceptual regress → halt → conceptual regress → halt →. Or we may wish to operationalize these concepts and then to "capture" data in relation to them. Either way or both, we shall find out more than we now know about the determined and determining in human symbolic transaction.

Three. To re-read the last paragraph and remind ourselves that it populated the world with entities such as "creativity," "intelligence," "mind," and "economy"--not to mention that this section on scholarly news depends entirely on "special topics" drawn from study of the entity of "patterns"--is to see that we need to do more with the communicative

creation and sharing of those abstractions which are taken for granted as entities, reifications. Like tendencies toward infinite regress, study of reifying need not be fraught with pejoration. To agree is simply to recognize that most of our conceptions worked with on a taken-for-granted basis--including "communication"--are hypostatized. So are conceptions such as "attitudes," "norms," and "historical forces." The study of the communicative process involved in reifying will move us along toward a greater understanding of patterns-in-the-large in human communicating. Space and time requirements make me leave this topic before I want to; I refer you to a fuller discussion of the possibilities for research into hypostatizing which appears in the Central States Speech Journal.⁹ (I also believe that the next special topic is a cousin to this one.)

Four. We need much more than we have done in the past to study human communication as culture-building. Aside from the fact that "culture" itself is an hypostatized term deserving of study into its process of creation, we need to understand ways in which large groups of people apparently are able to take for granted, as though matters of uncontested fact, large bodies of human interpretations as being part of the world's physical make-up. Edmund Leach, a British symbolic anthropologist, makes clear to us (as we might not see for ourselves within our own disciplinary culture) that such a study falls clearly within the province of rhetoric as delineated by Chaim Perelman: the study of confused ideas. Briefly, the starting point Leach gives us for the study of culture-as-collections-of-confused-ideas is his notion that we often mix two codes: one which he says is generated by metaphor, the use of the name of one conception to name another with an abstractable

similarity; the other which he says is generated by metonymy, the use of a part of an entity to recognize its presence. "By code switching between symbols and signs," he says, "we are able to persuade one another that metaphoric non-sense is really metonymic sense."¹⁰ With this in mind and moving closer to home and the familiar ground of Richard Weaver, we are led to ask whether our culture's god terms of freedom, equality, individualism, success, and progress are the outcome of such persuasion as Leach describes, a way to think of persuasion as the enactment of culture. What grand pattern of such enacting awaits our discernment? Does it hold across cultures other than our own? To answer such questions is, as a field, to move toward a better sense than we now have of the constrained and the constraining in human communication.

Five. Lurking behind each of the preceding four is a topic formerly thought of as part of the field of rhetoric, but now no longer so: memory--or to use the term popular in psychology and educationist circles, learning. As Schaefermeier and I have suggested elsewhere,¹¹ the progress of communication as a social science may depend on the willingness and ability of the field to contribute to the answer for the old nature-nurture controversy that animated different schools of rhetorical pedagogy in classical times. The newer version of that question has been raised, in its assumption of determinism, by serious sociobiologists like E. O. Wilson and, in its assumption of non-determinism, by Kenneth Boulding. In the refinement of the question that arises from an inquisitive reading of their work of the middle and late 'Seventies,' one finds the locus for what may be the grand pattern of all patterns in human symboling. It is this: How do we learn to

learn? Besides the start of what may be an infinite regress, the question, prompted by Wilson and Boulding, is whether learning to learn is primarily constrained or primarily constraining. Do the genes, to use Wilson's expression, hold culture on a leash? Not only can our specialists in communication education muster their energies to pursue the topic, but anyone in our field who is interested in language learning and the role of media in learning will be well-positioned to participate in the research. In the case of the latter, the wide-focus of media studies and learning lends itself well to the study of patterns-in-the large.

What to publish? Considered as special topics, exciting research news awaits scholars in their investigations of attention-shifting, starting and stopping the infinite regress, hypostatizing, enacting culture, and learning--all in the service of the quest for patterns-in-the-large, determined and determining, in human communication.

In conclusion, several concerns arise.

Why speak of the search for patterns-in-the-large, when so much of the current work in our field seemingly avoids the macro-approach? Actually, the study of human communication is, by its being concerned with abstractions, already committed to looking at patterns-in-the-large--as is illustrated by this analogy I quote from Hofstadter:

Watching one's own internal microscopic patterns of activity is bound to be boring, because any complex system is bound to be made up of thousands, millions or even more copies of small elements (gears, transistors, cells and so on). What is critical is to be able to watch activities on a completely different level, the

collective level, in which huge patterns of activity of these many components assume regular kinds of behavior perceptible on their own. A hurricane is a huge pattern of activity of tiny atoms, but one with such regularity and pattern that we can predict the behavior of hurricanes without ever thinking of their constituent atoms. A thought is a huge pattern of activity of tiny cells, and much the same can be said of it.¹²

Since dominant trends of research in our field have not depended on the monitoring of neurons firing across synapses during acts of communication, we are already looking at patterns-in-the-large. I am suggesting that larger patterns-in-the-large are a newsworthy special topic.

Next, if what I have suggested turns out to be basic knowledge of human communication, another newsworthy topic arises--a theme part and parcel with the ones just enumerated. Acquiring self-conscious knowledge of culture-bound and culture-free patterns of symboling carries with it the responsibility of asking whose purposes it might serve, for whom it might be treated as power, and to what ends it might be enlisted. Since Plato, thinkers have speculated on the possibility of total social control, often a benign control--from the viewpoint of the would-be controller. The scholar and researcher will not be able to stand aside from those questions, including the possibility that oneself might become a philosopher monarch.

Finally, I am suggesting that if students of human consciousness have intuited its basis, the patterns--determined and determining--which appear panoramically are likely to be patterns in self-monitoring. Not a form of scholarly narcissism, such an object of research promises us

all--no matter whether we now classify ourselves by the level of communication being studied or by the means we take to study it--the recognition of an absorbing "intimate subject," one which relates basically to our present pattern-seeking studies, and one which invites us to new Everests in our intellectual mountain-climbing. And that, after all, is the greatest reward of our profession: through the making and--with the help of editors who also are willing to take risks--the sharing of scholarly news, not to be bored.

Notes

¹"Another Shooting in Cowtown," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 67 (November 1981), 351.

²Ibid.

³"Rhetorical Criticism as Argument," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 60 (April 1974), 166, 170.

⁴Richard Bellman, "Mathematics and the Human Sciences," The Dynamic Programming of Human Systems: A Social and Historical Analysis, ed. by John Wilkinson, Richard Bellman, and Roger Garaudy (New York: Published for the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions by ASS Information Corporation, 1973), p. 16.

⁵"Retrospective Futurology or the Dialogue of Civilizations," ibid, p. 21.

⁶See, for example, the use of the Sphex wasp: patterns of egg-laying by Dean E. Woolridge in his Mechanical Man: The Physical Basis of Intelligent Life, as quoted by Douglas R. Hofstadter in "Metamagical Themas," The Scientific American (September 1983), p. 22 and Hofstadter's own suggestion of an infinite regress → halting → infinite regress → halting pattern in human intellection, especially in ibid., p. 24 ff.

⁷Kenneth E. Boulding, Ecodynamics: A New Theory of Societal Evolution (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1978), p. 128.

⁸Quoted by Hofstadter, p. 28.

⁹See my "New Media and the Rhetoric of Value Selection," presented at convention of Speech Communication Association, Louisville, Kentucky, November, 1982.

¹⁰See my "Public Address in an Age of Information," Central States Speech Journal, 32 (Winter 1981), 227-235.

¹¹Edmund Leach, Culture and Communication: The Logic by Which Symbols are Connected (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), p. 22.

¹²"Progress in Communication as a Social Science," Communication Yearbook IV, ed. Dan Nimmo (International Communication Association, 1980), pp. 37-47.

¹³*Op. cit.*, p. 24.

PUBLISH HOW?

Dennis S. Gouran

Author Note: Dennis S. Gouran is Professor of Speech Communication at Indiana University. This essay is based on a presentation originally made at the annual convention of the Central States Speech Association in Lincoln, Nebraska, April 9, 1983.

PUBLISH HOW?

A neglected part of the training of graduate students in Speech Communication involves matters concerning the preparation and submission of manuscripts for publication in professional journals. Although some students acquire experience in working with experienced researchers, formal exposure to the editorial process does not appear to be part of the education of individuals pursuing advanced degrees in the discipline. The unfortunate consequence of such neglect is that too few of our graduates experience the sort of early success that stimulates a desire to remain active in scholarship. Even a casual glance at the author index in Matlon's comprehensive listing of communication journal articles reveals that the most frequently occurring number of publications associated with the people listed is one.¹ Presumably, an even larger number of individuals have no publications at all. To the extent that an ignorance of the various facets of the editorial review process has discouraged scholarly efforts by representatives of our discipline, this situation is unfortunate.

The purpose of this essay is to offer some general thoughts and guidelines that one should try to keep in mind when preparing a manuscript for publication, selecting an appropriate journal or related outlet, and otherwise going through the review process. To a large extent, the notions presented reflect my own experience as a former editor of the Central States Speech Journal, evaluator for other journals, and contributor. The information is intended primarily for the benefit of individuals new to the

editorial review process. The considerations outlined are by no means exhaustive but merely reflect an effort to alert prospective contributors to published scholarship in Speech Communication to some of what is involved in seeing a manuscript through from its inception to its eventual appearance in print. The guidelines entail both technical and interpersonal considerations.

SUBMISSION

Although one may have any number of different motives in deciding to submit a manuscript to a professional journal for possible publication, the most crucial concern is that he or she have something to say. One must be convinced that what he or she wishes to share with an informed readership constitutes an advance in knowledge pertinent to communication, increases our understanding of an issue relevant to the discipline, represent a fresh way of viewing relationships among communicative phenomena, or possesses some pragmatic value that previous scholarship has heretofore failed to produce.

For the individual not certain about the kinds of issues in need of address, the Spring, 1979 and the Winter, 1981 issues of the Central States Speech Journal may prove helpful. In the first of these two special issues, a number of prominent scholars have taken a critical look at the state of scholarship in Speech Communication and, in particular, the role of criticism in shaping the agenda of the field. The second and more recent issue of the journal is a compilation of specific knowledge objectives that the contributors in the various areas represented argue our field should be trying to achieve.

Even if one is convinced that a manuscript on which he or she is working makes one of the sorts of contributions mentioned above, it is important

to avoid premature submission. Otherwise, a potentially publishable piece of work may never appear in print. Because we are not always the best judges of our own work, one probably should cultivate the practice of soliciting others' reactions to his or her manuscripts before even considering whether or not to submit them for publication. If one follows this practice, it is also important that he or she seek out individuals who will give honest and carefully considered comments about the quality of the manuscript, the adequacy of its development, and the clarity with which it is written. A few hurt feelings is a small price to pay if an honest, hard-nosed critique contributes to a demonstrably improved manuscript.

As one moves into the final stages of manuscript preparation, he or she needs to begin considering which among many is the most appropriate journal for the type of scholarship being reported. Making this choice is much easier if one has a general familiarity with the editorial policies of communication journals and those in related or cognate disciplines. Without a knowledge of the policies outlining the sorts of scholarship that a given journal considers suitable, one can choose inappropriately and waste valuable time discovering that he or she should have submitted the manuscript to some journal other than the one he or she has selected.

Many beginning scholars select journals on the basis of what they have heard about their prestige. And although professional journals do vary in terms of prestige, the more important consideration is appropriateness. If one is doing outstanding work, prestige will tend to take care of itself. In addition, journals in Speech Communication tend not to vary so much in terms of their status as they do in emphasis. Such differences should become more clear in the next section of this essay.

Once an individual has selected an appropriate journal, he or she

should carefully review the stylistic and manuscript submission requirements and follow them to the letter in preparing a final draft of the manuscript. If the requirements seem to be unclear, then one is well advised to examine a sample of current articles in the journal to verify his or her interpretation.

In Speech Communication, most of the professional journals base their requirements for style on the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association or the MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations. Some follow the guidelines of the MLA Style Sheet. It is, therefore, a good idea for one to have access to these manuals and to consult them regularly in preparing a manuscript.

A manuscript that does not conform to the stylistic requirements of the journal to which it is submitted has a greater chance of rejection than one that does conform. Editors vary in their tolerance for this sort of non-conformity, but it is better not to take the risk in the first place. It is also a good idea to avoid such practices as whiting out references made in one stylistic form and typing in the correct form on an extant copy of a manuscript. One should also avoid submitting a manuscript in the wrong stylistic form and telling the editor in the cover letter that he or she will tidy it up after the manuscript has undergone an initial review.

After the final draft of one's manuscript has been prepared, the contributor should write a cover letter in which he or she respectfully requests that the accompanying manuscript be considered for possible publication. In so doing, one should avoid referring to the manuscript as an article (that is presumptuous) and refrain from telling the editor how to do his or her job; for example, "Please acknowledge receipt of my manuscript as soon as possible, and notify me as to when I can expect a

final decision. Finally, it is not a good idea to inform an editor of other people's assessments of the quality of the manuscript; for instance, "My advisor believes that this is an important piece of research," or, "This paper made the 'Top Three' in the Interpersonal and Small Group Interaction at last year's SCA Convention." These sorts of comments convey the impression that the editor and his or her reviewers may not be competent to judge the quality of the work under consideration.

A practice in which some people engage is to submit a manuscript to several journals simultaneously. To do this, however, is to inconvenience those who are reviewing the manuscript and raises some serious questions about one's professionalism. In addition, one takes the risk of having more than one acceptance and the resulting embarrassment of having to withdraw a manuscript from consideration after it has been accepted for publication. One should, therefore, submit a manuscript to only one journal at a time and wait for a decision. If he or she is not satisfied with the service of a given journal, one can always request return of the manuscript.

SOURCES OF PUBLICATION

Although editorial policy tends to vary with changes in the editorship of professional journals and related sources of publication, most such publication outlets can be classified in terms of a generalist/specialist focus with respect to substance and/or research styles. Following are some general descriptions of journals (and annuals) in Speech Communication and Communication, in general, that one may wish to consider in selecting an outlet for his or her scholarship. The descriptions are necessarily incomplete, and one would be ill advised to make a selection on this basis alone. Prospective contributors should always carefully examine the

editorial policy of the source to which they are considering submitting their manuscripts. Should one have any doubt about the policy, then he or she may wish to contact the editor in charge at the time the manuscript is being readied for submission.

Journals and annuals to which one may wish to submit scholarly manuscripts dealing with communication include:

Quarterly Journal of Speech: Tends to focus on historically oriented, critical, and theoretically grounded scholarship in all areas of the discipline.

Communication Monographs: Focuses on the more quantitatively oriented, empirical, and experimental scholarship in most, if not all, areas of the discipline.

Communication Education: Emphasizes pedagogically relevant scholarship, regardless of the area of the discipline and reflects no particular bias toward any methodological style of inquiry.

Central States Speech Journal, Western Journal of Speech Communication, Southern Speech Communication Journal, and Communication Quarterly: Regional association journals that tend to be generalist in coverage and reflect no particular substantive or methodological focus.

Critical Studies in Mass Communication: In its first year of existence and not yet available but has an obvious substantive focus on issues Telecommunication, Journalism, and Film.

Literature in Performance: Obvious substantive focus on issues in interpretation, dramatic theory, and literary criticism. Reflects a descriptive/critical/applied orientation.

International and Intercultural Annual: Substantive focus on cross-cultural issues in communication with no particular methodological emphasis or bias evident.

Free Speech Yearbook: Clear substantive focus on the ethical and legal aspects of issues involving freedom of expression. Has a predominately historical/critical methodological emphasis.

Journal of Communication: Tends to focus on, but is not restricted to, issues in Mass Communication. Emphasizes applied concerns but contains scholarship reflecting a wide variety of theoretical concerns and methods of inquiry.

Journal of Applied Communication: Addressed to issues surrounding the practice of communication (strategies and sources of effectiveness) in different social contexts.

Communication Research: Emphasizes quantitatively oriented and empirical scholarship largely in the area of Interpersonal Communication.

Human Communication Research: Similar to Communication Monographs in terms of methodological style but with a much stronger emphasis on empirical methods, theory building, and mathematical modeling. Also more focused on communication in interpersonal, group, organizational, political, and public contexts.

Journal of the American Forensic Association: Focuses on issues deal with theories of argument and public debate. No particular methodological emphasis.

Association for Communication Administration Bulletin: Deals with issues affecting administrative practices involved in the development of the discipline and related concerns. No particular methodological emphasis.

Other journals suitable for scholarship in communication that one should consider as possible sources of publication include Small Group

Behavior, Groups & Organization Studies, Journalism Quarterly, Journal of Broadcasting, Public Opinion Quarterly, Presidential Studies Quarterly, Psychological Reports, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Political Science Quarterly, Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, Philosophy and Rhetoric, and Educational Theatre Journal.

For materials dealing with pedagogically related issues, one can also consider the Speech Communication Association's Module for the Educational Resources and Information Center (ERIC). Manuscripts submitted to this source are refereed and if accepted are abstracted for inclusion in Resources in Education. The accepted document is also then placed on microfiche and is made available in that form to interested readers through the Clearinghouse.

THE EDITORIAL REVIEW PROCESS

Because of the time invested in the preparation of a manuscript is usually considerable, it is understandable that one is anxious to receive word about the status of his or her manuscript as quickly as possible once it has been submitted. However, impatience can create unnecessary difficulties. One should start with the assumption that the editor to whom the manuscript has been submitted understands the need for processing manuscripts as quickly as possible and will make every effort to act accordingly. Most editors, for instance, will acknowledge receipt of a manuscript within two to three weeks. If one has not received such an acknowledgement within a month following submission, it may be advisable to contact the editor simply to determine if the manuscript has arrived. Making such inquiries earlier than this can only serve as an irritant that the editor does not need.

When one has not received word concerning the status of a manuscript within the time indicated for a typical review by the editor in his or her acknowledgment, some contributors begin to feel that their manuscripts have been lost or that the editor is deliberately delaying notification. A more likely explanation, however, is that the manuscript is in the hands of a delinquent reader. Under the circumstances, one should probably wait another month or so before contacting the editor. If one becomes increasingly dissatisfied with a seemingly long delay, it is better simply to withdraw the manuscript from consideration than to try to force a decision when the editor has incomplete evaluations.

If an editor rejects a manuscript, the contributor should accept that decision. Submission in the first place entails the recognition of the editor's right to decide whether or not one's manuscript is suitable for publication. In addition, there is little prospect of having a decision reversed, and in arguing that way, one only creates the sort of ill will that may make any further dealings with the editor in question more difficult. If one's scholarship is indeed worthy of the kind of exposure that publication in a professional journal provides, the system of checks and balances within the academic community are such that the related manuscript will eventually find its way into print. ³ Rather than quibbling with an editor about his or her judgment, one can spend time more profitably reviewing the criticisms he or she has received and preparing the manuscript for submission to another journal.

When an editor provides an opportunity for a contributor to revise and re-submit a manuscript, one should take advantage of it. Such invitations to try again do not constitute a guarantee of publication, but the chances for a subsequently favorable decision are usually enhanced. In the event

of one's being invited to re-submit a manuscript, he or she should take great care to revise in accordance with the editor's suggestions (in some cases, dictates) unless that would seriously compromise the content of the manuscript. In that case, it is best to contact the editor, explain one's concerns, and determine what can be worked out that will be mutually acceptable. In my experience as an editor, the individuals who were most cooperative in following advice were seasoned scholars, and those least cooperative were individuals who had not previously published anything. Being cooperative, I assume, is one reason why experienced and established scholars are successful in their publication efforts.

Should one's manuscript be accepted for publication, he or she should realize that it can still be withdrawn if one fails to make the necessary modifications by the time the editor has specified. The same applies to the correction and return of page proofs. One needs to learn the importance of promptness early on even if the editor has not been particularly efficient in processing the manuscript.

Criticism is hardly ever pleasant, but prospective contributors to journals must learn to refrain from taking it too personally. In most instances, even the most untactful of editors and manuscript reviewers are trying to be helpful. While disappointment and anger are understandable responses to criticism, they have little value in furthering one's chances for securing favorable publication decisions. However biting or unflattering the criticism one receives in going through the editorial review process, the question that he or she must eventually address is whether or not there is any substance in what is being communicated. Those who develop this posture tend to profit from their experiences and go on to become successful scholars.

Finally, one needs to avoid acting as if he or she were doing an

editor a favor in submitting a manuscript. Many people inexperienced in publishing their research do not even send a cover letter along with the manuscripts they submit for consideration. Others become very condescending, especially if it appears that the manuscript will be published. Since submissions to professional journals typically exceed acceptances by a substantial margin, most professional journals that I know of can go to press without any particular individual's work.

A FINAL THOUGHT

Knowing about the publication process can facilitate one's gaining entry into the community of publishing scholars, but that knowledge alone is insufficient to assure success to anyone, experienced or inexperienced. Success in scholarship is first and foremost a matter of commitment to and a kind of enchantment with the examination of ideas. Without these attributes and the necessary intellectual skills that enable one to explore ideas profitably, there is little chance of one's making the kinds of contributions that peer review will find worth others' attention.

ENDNOTES

1

Ronald J. Matton, Index to Journals in Communication Studies Through 1979 (Annandale, Virginia: Speech Communication Association, 1980).

2

For a more extended discussion of the functions of the journal article, see William D. Garvey, Communication: The Essence of Science (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1979), pp. 69-90.

3

Abraham Kaplan, The Conduct of Inquiry (San Francisco: Chandler, 1964), p. 376.

THE PROBLEM OF PUBLICATION:
A RESPONSE

Donald H. Ecroyd

There is no question about it. Especially for faculty in departments with graduate programs, the present rule is "publish or perish." Tenure and promotion decisions are frequently being made on this basis. In many institutions the presumption is that one's teaching is effective and that one's service to the university and the academic discipline is sufficient. Unless something truly outstanding in one of these areas can be demonstrated, brief citations of new courses developed, old courses revised, independent studies directed, and committees chaired or administrative duties completed, are enough to include in the materials presented for evaluation. The crucial category will be scholarship and publication.

Moreover, evaluation committees and deans are taking a more and more careful look at what is presented in this category. It is no longer enough merely to list presentations to professional organizations or to cite articles published in professional journals. It is now necessary to specify whether or not such presentations and articles were chosen as the result of refereed procedures. In some cases a point system is even superimposed, giving more weight to presentations to certain organizations than to others, and to articles appearing in preferred journals. Book reviews no longer seem to count for much. Articles in popular magazines are often disregarded. In some cases, outside experts are asked to read and evaluate a colleague's published output, and to offer critical comment as to the quality of the research represented and its potential importance to the field.

As the editor of a refereed quarterly journal, sponsored by a national professional organization, with a circulation of from four to five thousand copies for each issue, I am besieged with submissions. Communication Education

Donald H. Ecroyd is Professor of Speech, Temple University, Philadelphia, and Editor, Communication Education, a publication of the Speech Communication Association.

can only publish 40-50 articles a year. My editors and I have read over 600 manuscripts since November of 1980, the beginning of my term of office. From these we have selected the 130 or so that will be published during my three years. As publishing costs go up, however, the number of available pages may decrease. At the same time, the academic budget crunch seems likely to continue, turning many junior faculty positions into revolving doors. To promote means to increase salaries. To tenure means eligibility for automatic salary increases. If a departmental budget is static or reduced, there may be no real options. The best way to balance the budget may be to hire a new, untenured faculty member at entry-level salary rather than to tenure or promote. In some institutions--my own included--no one is really safe. Even tenured faculty have been dismissed for budgetary and programmatic reasons.

All of this means, of course, that getting published has become a problem for almost everyone in the academic world, especially for faculty members just beginning their careers. In the articles to which this response is directed, Berquist tells us that eight out of ten Ph. D's in our field never publish, and Gouran points out that the most frequent number of publications listed in the Matlon Index of our regional and national journals is only one. But such figures do not include the rejection slips. If two communication faculty members out of ten have published, many more have attempted to do so and given up in discouragement. Now that academic employment has become more difficult to obtain in our field, even more are trying to get their words into print. The Matlon Index only goes through 1979. Things are different now in the employment marketplace than they were even five or six years ago. I have a hunch that those Ph. D's who received their degrees within that period are writing and submitting at a rate far higher than the old eight out of ten figure would suggest. I also have a hunch that many of those with only one index entry prior to 1979 have been trying to increase their list. Teaching excellence and service are not always enough to insure tenure or promotion any more, and even one or two articles in good journals can make a difference. Thus, at the very moment when fewer journal slots are becoming available, more people are trying to get published.

The suggestions in these three articles are designed to help you meet this difficult situation. If you would publish, Brown says you must seek out "scholarly news," and not just tell us what we know already. Berquist urges that you not neglect your writing, but sit down regularly with pen in hand. Writing, after all, is not just a skill; it is also a habit. When you were in school, you wrote with regularity. Now that you are teaching, it may have been some time since you went through the careful discipline of making revisions or conforming footnotes to a style manual. Gouran tells you to assess the publication to which you submit. If your piece is not on an appropriate topic or is inappropriate in presentation, everyone's time has been wasted--especially your own.

A good lesson plan, a clear classroom lecture, an old term paper that received a high mark, a well-written thesis or dissertation chapter, or even — a well received convention presentation, does not necessarily make a good article. We all know the maxim that a good speech is not likely to be an essay on its hind legs. The reverse is equally true. On the other hand, if the topic has gone well somewhere, and if its development makes some concept clear or adds new information, there may be reason to try to rewrite. But do not just photocopy something and send it off. Situation one is not situation two, you know. One cannot take something intended for one purpose and make it work--come rain or come shine--for another.

Frankly, in most cases when I have rejected articles it was because the authors did not really do the very things they teach their students to do. The potential audience was not analyzed carefully enough. There was no clear sense of thesis and development. The style did not adapt to the audience, the topic, the medium. There was not enough evidence. The lines of argument were fuzzy. The introduction and conclusion were dull or undeveloped. Writing for publication is, among other things, a rhetorical act; and, as Aristotle long ago observed, rhetoric finds its end in judgment. It is the rhetor's intent within a situation that must determine the choices he or she makes. One does not just "sit down and write an article."

As I said in the beginning, the academic world is more responsive to scholarly presentations and to publication than it has ever been--at least within my academic lifetime. This situation has increased the number of manuscripts being submitted, and made their acceptance or rejection more important to their writers. At the same time, the number of slots available for articles to be published in professional journals is severely limited. The result has been increased competition for those slots.

If your intent is to submit a publishable article to a journal, then, you must be prepared to do your homework. Your "scholarly news" must not only be something you like and are genuinely interested in sharing, it must also be appropriate to a particular group of readers. It must be well thought out. It must be well expressed. Here is the crux of the matter if you would publish and not perish. As Chesterton observed long ago, if you would shine you must first light the lamp.